EXHIBIT A-1

MR. CERA: No, Your Honor. I would like longer than that. I would like to point out, Your Honor, this is the first complaint that my client has filed in this matter. We are dealing with the PSLRA, a very demanding statute as Your Honor knows and as apparent from Your Honor's opinions. Many of these opinions have talked about how it's very demanding on a plaintiff to do this.

We have no discovery. Cabletron talked about standards to be applied in evaluating the complaint are different before and after discovery. We have had absolutely no discovery. We have no cooperation from the issuer, no cooperation from any of the defendants. There are confidential agreements that they have with respect to former employees that they tried to enforce. We are doing our best, Your Honor, to investigate with the tools that we have at our disposal. I would like a longer period.

THE COURT: Wouldn't be any better if I dismissed the complain and gave you leave to file again.

MR. CERA: Well, Your Honor, it might be in the sense that we would know what the Court found to be deficient.

THE COURT: True. What you get is a preliminary read from the Court on that, and then I have to tell you is what I find most objectionable about this, that there is this extraordinarily demand for time and resources and

effort on the part of the Court to function more less like
the fellow behind the elephant.

MR. CERA: Your Honor, I appreciate that, and I know it's demanding. It's a difficult area of the law, and there are tons of cases to analyze and a lot of authority but, Your Honor, the Federal Supplement and the Federal Reporter are full of decisions by courts considering complaints, analyzing them, and then pointing out in what ways they are deficient and allowing leave to amendment. In fact, some of your prior opinions have done that, and I appreciate that it is burdensome on the Court.

Your Honor, I would certainly like to know how the Court feels our complaint is deficient.

THE COURT: Is there any litigant anywhere who wouldn't want a preview of what the Court is going to do in ruling on a particular motion?

MR. CERA: Of course, Your Honor. Of course we would like that.

THE COURT: So now we are talking about trying to find some way, fairly but expeditiously, to resolve this with a minimal amount of demand resource of all parties. What happens is that there are fully briefed motions like this in which you see what it is that defendants say is deficient. And then you say, what we would like is a preliminary view from the Judge. And frankly, I am not

going to do it.

MR. CERA: I appreciate that. I know Your Honor knows that no matter what we allege in the amended complaint, if we got, you know, 500 pages of specific allegations from confidential witnesses, they are going to say the same thing, Your Honor, no matter what we allege. And ultimately we are going to —

THE COURT: Then you get to say the same thing twice; is that right?

MR. CERA: No, Your Honor, because we believe we are going to be able to convince you with our allegations and our arguments that the complaint is sufficient under --

THE COURT: And I will give you the opportunity to do so.

MR. CERA: Very well.

THE COURT: But not the opportunity to do so once and then do so again and do so again. You've got to come to rest on this --

MR. CERA: Your Honor, as pointed out --

THE COURT: -- in light of the options that have been raised, which are the ones that I am going to rule on.

MR. CERA: Your Honor, as I pointed out, this is our first complaint in this litigation. We would like a minimum of 60 days.

THE COURT: A minimum of 60 days?

MR. CERA: Your Honor, because since this complaint was tendered to the court in December 2004, we are continuing to investigate this case on behalf of our client and the class. There are new efforts being made to find sources of information, to fill in whole, so the court may find exist to satisfy the pleaing standard, that is the defendants are going to say violated no matter what we allege, that takes time. There is no cooperation. no discovery. There are confidentiality agreements.

THE COURT: You told me that, and that frankly is not very much different from any other case in this posture.

MR. CERA: Well, Your Honor, I am aware of cases in this posture that routinely get 60 days leave to amend.

THE COURT: It's not a matter of 60 days to amend. The situation is you are at the motion to dismiss stage. That is what the PR -- it's a critical stage in this litigation, and it is within entitlement to enforce discovery. Nothing new there.

MR. CERA: Right.

THE COURT: That has been the case all along. you say 60 days is going to be better?

MR. CERA: I am sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: 60 days is going to be better?

MR. CERA: Your Honor, we will have --

THE COURT: One that you have to rise and fall on;

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

you understand that?

MR. CERA: I hear what Your Honor is saying, Your Honor, and I think we will have greater detail in that complaint to the extent that we can do it, of course we will. That is our job as lawyers, and we fully intend to do it. I was prepared to argue today, Your Honor, why this complaint should satisfy the Cabletron standards. I am prepared to do that, but if Your Honor preliminary indication is you don't want to go into that exercise because of the burden, we will take the 60 days and improve it.

THE COURT: I tell you what my principal concern was and is, I find it an affront, frankly, to read through a lengthy brief, some 45 pages long, only to be told if for any reason the Court finds the allegations insufficient, we respectfully request leave to amend, not because we have found something new, but simply because we want a chance to engage in an interim process with the Court. And that, it seems to me, is a very substantial presumption upon resources of the Court. There are other cases. I assure you there are other cases on the docket, and they require attention, too.

MR. CERA: Of course.

THE COURT: And the idea that we get to have rough drafts of resolutions isn't particularly appealing to me.

MR. CERA: I appreciate that, Your Honor, and I understand the Court's feelings about that. It certainly wasn't meant in any way as an affront. It was a -- we cited Your Honor's own opinion.

THE COURT: Prior to which I cited the Supreme Court's instruction necessary in the absence of the undue delay, bad faith, dilatory motive, repeated failure to cure deficiencies, undue prejudice, those are the standards. But now I am going to permit that, so that we are all going to be focused on what you think your best shot is.

MR. CERA: Okay. Your Honor, I accept that. As I say, I was prepared to defend this complaint, but we will give you our best shot the next time. If we can --

THE COURT: One that you are prepared to live or die with; is that right?

I am asking this question in this way because I don't want to be faced again with someone saying -- well, you can always improve a complaint, which is no doubt true, and at some point, it has to come to an end.

MR. CERA: Your Honor, I understand. I have been practicing in this area 25 years, and this is frankly an extraordinary situation, I think, for plaintiff in this position because, frankly, the normal experience, the common experience if you will that have I had in security litigation where it has become increasingly difficult to

state a claim for relief under the PSLRA is that courts --

THE COURT: Not in the First Circuit. The standards of appeals are frankly what the First Circuit have

4 been talking about for some time.

. 9

1.8

MR. CERA: I understand that, but I understand your court -- Court basically telling us today that this complaint is insufficient.

THE COURT: I haven't told you any such thing. I asked you whether or not you are ready to go with it, understanding that there will not be leave to amend if you rise and fall on this complaint, and I have dismissed it.

MR. CERA: Your Honor, I am not going to forego the opportunity to add to this complaint.

THE COURT: All right. So that's where we are.

MR. CERA: Very well.

THE COURT: And I want you to understand that you give me a date, and that will be the date on which you rise or fall.

MR. CERA: We would like 60 days, Your Honor, from today.

THE COURT: All right. Now, while we are at it, so you got some idea of what is on my mind, why do you need to have undisclosed witnesses? Undisclosed -- first thing that is going to happen in the discovery in any case is they are going to ask who introduced this unnamed vice president,

so why don't you name them?

1.2

MR. CERA: Your Honor, the answer to that is essentially honoring a request from the witness at this point in time.

THE COURT: Okay. You honor it at the time of discovery?

MR. CERA: I think not, Your Honor. There is disclosure obligations.

THE COURT: Now we are talking about when it is you are going to disclose, not when.

MR. CERA: Your Honor, I don't feel right, if you will, in being told by a witness that we prefer at this time to remain anonymous for reasons that I may not be aware of.

THE COURT: You've got to articulate them in some fashion. I mean, you know, if I am doing a search warrant, I have to have some justification for unnamed informants and some basis to rely upon the statement of unnamed informants. So you talked to people who don't want to have their names used at this time. So they are waiting to see whether or not I let the complaint be amended; is that it?

MR. CERA: Your Honor, I don't think they are thinking of it in those terms. It's very common for securities complaints to have unnamed confidential sources.

THE COURT: I see that, and I have seen the case law on it and, frankly, it's become something of an

epidemic, and I want to step back from that and ask a question that I have actually asked of a couple other cases already, which is sooner or later these people's names are going to be known, unless you are unsuccessful.

And so exactly what I suggested earlier, this is something of a game of chicken. See whether or not you can make it past the initial huddle, that's various kinds of procedural requirements imposed with a minimal amount of effort. So --

MR. CERA: No.

THE COURT: Short of it is you are not telling, not identifying who these unnamed informants are because they asked you not to without having some reason for doing that.

MR. CERA: Your Honor, first of all, I want to assure the Court we are not trying to escape here with minimal amount of effort, and there is no connection between that and not naming the source. We made a significant effort under very difficult circumstances.

Your Honor, the law doesn't require it at this point. The First Circuit law does not require disclosure of the names as long as there is other information presented in the complaint that corroborates or tends to corroborate the veracity of the information.

THE COURT: I am not saying it's required. I am

asking why you aren't doing it.

MR. CERA: Your Honor, because it's fear of retribution of some of the witnesses by the company.

THE COURT: Won't there be retribution when their names are discovered?

MR. CERA: It may or may not be. It's unknown. I don't know what is going to happen in the future. No one knows what is going to happen to this company or to these people. It's all speculation. If the time comes that it's required to make disclosures, the disclosures will be made. But at this point in time, when we are talking about investigating a complaint and gathering information, and you are dealing with former employees or former officers who may be on bad terms with the company and expressly request at this point in time --

THE COURT: If they are former employees on bad terms with the company, is that something that should be disclosed in the complaint for purposes of evaluating the credibility of statements that they have made and whether or not it fits together?

MR. CERA: That is a good question, Your Honor, but I don't think it needs to be disclosed, no, and I didn't mean to suggest by the way in any way, shape, or form that was the situation here.

THE COURT: Just something that came to mind as

you were discussing it.

MR. CERA: I understand. Your Honor, no, I don't think it needs to be disclosed. There is all kinds of permutation of factual scenarios that can arise in this world.

THE COURT: I am fully aware of that. I raise the question. You are required to do it, but it's certainly something that will be taken into consideration in trying to piece together the degree of which this complaint meets the obligation to show a strong likelihood of or make strong demonstration of --

MR. CERA: Fair in mind -- Your Honor, we will keep that in mind.

THE COURT: I go back to the earlier question.

This is simply to provide cover for the people who -- there is no other justification, no one made a justification for it?

MR. CERA: Your Honor, I think at the end of the day, that's the reason. That's -- I have given you the reason. I don't know what it may be in these witnesses' heads. They have requested confidentiality, and I am not a mind reader. I am a lawyer, operating and trying to investigate, and I have agreed to honor that request.

THE COURT: Okay. You have in mind a perspective that I have, and it's this, that from assistant attorney

dime me with an unnamed informant, I would ask some questions to determine whether or not there was probable cause, and I am not sure why I shouldn't do that here.

There is of course case law out there where principally from the Second Circuit, dealing with this kind of issue. It is, I think, a work in progress on these issues, and so I raise it so that you are not surprised if in evaluating a claim in which there is simply hung out some description of a job and unnamed holder of that job, that not much weight is attached to assertions.

MR. CERA: Very well, Your Honor. We will keep that in mind. I want to assure the Court, however, that these are real people, and this is real information, and if the difference is going to be just providing a name and that's going to tip the balance --

THE COURT: Let me tell you what I have done in certain cases. When I have had some question about whether or not there are real people with real positions, I have required that the investigative basis for it be provided to me in camera.

MR. CERA: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: So just telling you how carefully I intend to read this and have here. There are important principles involved in all of this, and the use, increasing use of unnamed informants seems to me to be a trend not

necessarily to be encouraged.

MR. CERA: Okay. We will definitely keep that in mind, Your Honor, in formulating the next complaint.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So 30 days for the derivative plaintiffs to file their complaint. Their final complaint, which is July 1. 60 days for the securities plaintiffs to file their final complaint, which is August 5th. The responses, responsive pleading for the derivative defendants, August 5th, and the opposition by August -- I know I am getting on people's vacations.

MR. HALSTON: I was wondering if we could have until August 15th. I know I have two weeks of vacation there, and I asked Mr. Gold and I understand he does as well.

THE COURT: Okay. So August 15 for response of pleadings and then September 12 for opposition reply by September 23rd, we undoubtedly set it up for hearing in the early part of October, but I don't see a date yet for sure on the case. With respect to the -- sorry -- review of the case. With respect to the securities case, the complaint as said on August 5th, responsive pleadings. We will make it September 12. The opposition October 10 and reply October 21. Schedule them all on the --

MR. HALSTON: October.

THE COURT: October 21 and I won't schedule them

on the same day for a hearing, we will have separate dates 1 2 for. 3 So the motions to dismiss are denied as moved 4 having given leave to the plaintiffs to file amended 5 complaints. Here to address any potential deficiencies that 6 they may have identified with the understanding that that 7 will be also a complaint in both cases, and that is the 8 ruling in both cases, all right. Q, Anything else we need to deal with? 10 MR. CERA: No. 11 THE COURT: All right. We will be in recess. 12 THE CLERK: All rise. 13 (Recessed at 4:30 p.m.) 14 **** 15 COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 16 I, TERI CELESTE GIBSON, CSR, RPR, CRR, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 39, are a true 17 and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes taken in the above-entitled proceedings, prepared to the best of my

19

aforementioned.

18

20

21

22 23

24

25

CSR This certificate only applies to transcripts produced, copied, and signed by Teri Celeste Gibson, Court Reporter.

knowledge, skill, and ability at the time and place